



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/662,938	09/16/2003	Hideyuki Hashimoto	325772033200	2034

25227 7590 06/27/2008  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
1650 TYSONS BOULEVARD  
SUITE 400  
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER
----------

DHINGRA, PAWANDEEP

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2625

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/27/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/662,938	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HASHIMOTO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> PAWANDEEP S. DHINGRA	<b>Art Unit</b> 2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 March 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9-14, 16-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 15 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/28/2008</u> .   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

- This action is responsive to the following communication: Amendment after non-final rejection filed on 03/13/2008.
- Claims 9-19 are pending in the present application.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 03/13/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to applicant's argument that Fukuda fails to teach "a controller that determines an automatic-clear time for the input apparatus on which the input operation was performed, wherein a different automatic-clear time is determined for each of the plurality of input apparatuses". Applicant argues based on that "Kukuda teaches that a user can set a clearing time according to a selected function. In other words, the user can set various clearing times for various functions or operating modes of the apparatus. In contrast, according to claim 9, the automatic-clear time is determined based on which input apparatus is used and a different automatic-clear time is determined for each of the input apparatuses. Kukuda only ties the clearing time to selected functions which are not related to a specific input apparatus".

In reply, examiner asserts that Fukuda teaches a display 1 – touch panel LCD, ten key 2, start key 5, etc. (see paragraph 11-12). All of these are specific input apparatuses of the copy machine. The user uses the LCD touch panel for performing double-sided copy setting (see paragraph 11) and sets a desired clearing time for the double-side copy setting (see paragraph 19). On the other hand, the user uses ten key

2 to set the copy number of sheets setting (see paragraph 12), and again sets a desired clearing time for the number of sheets setting (see paragraph 19). Hence, Fukuda ties clearing time to a specific selected function which is related to a specific input apparatus - a touch panel or a key pad, and a different clear time is set for each specific input apparatus based on the function. Furthermore, for example, let's say if the clearing time for the number of sheets function is 10 seconds, then in that case the user has 10 seconds for operating the ten key pad 2 (ten key 2 is used to input the number of sheets setting operating mode). Hence, a controller determines an automatic-clear time for the ten key 2 on which the input of number of sheets operation was performed (see paragraphs 1-28).

Applicant further argues that Fukuda fails to teach "a table storing data of automatic-clear times respectively corresponding to the plurality of input apparatuses" as recited in claim 13. Applicant argues based on that "the table disclosed in Kukuda relates clear times to operating modes, not input apparatuses".

In reply, examiner asserts that the operating modes are related to the specific input apparatuses. The clear time corresponding to a specific operating mode is same for the input apparatus related to it (see discussion above). Hence, Fukuda teaches a table storing data of automatic-clear times respectively corresponding to the plurality of operating modes related to input apparatuses.

Note that, in case where only two operating modes are set - number of sheets, and double-sided copy, then in that case the clear times corresponding to a number of

sheets, and double-sided copy operating mode, respectively will be the same for the ten key 2 and the LCD touch panel, respectively (see discussion above). Moreover, the user can set same clear times for all operating modes *related to/inputted by* the LCD touch panel and a different set of same clear times for all the operating modes *related to/inputted by* the key pad.

Applicant further argues that Hirota fails to teach “a controller that determines an automatic-clear time for the input apparatus on which the input operation was performed, wherein a different automatic-clear time is determined for each of the plurality of input apparatuses”. Applicant argues based on that “Hirota teaches setting two different auto clear times, one for each of the two guidance displays which can be displayed (col. 5, lines 10-19). Thus, the auto-clear times are not determined differently depending on an input apparatus on which an input operation was performed. Hirota does disclose that a guidance mode can be selected which will extend the auto-clear time, but this does not mean that a different automatic clear time has been determined for a plurality of input apparatuses”.

In reply, examiner asserts that Hirota teaches determining an automatic-clear time for the input apparatus (see figure 1) on which the input operation was performed (see abstract; column 3, line 35-column 5, line 65, note that the auto clear process subroutine determines the auto clear time for inputs entered by the input apparatus), wherein a different automatic-clear time is determined for each of the plurality of input apparatuses (see figure 1) (see column 3, line 35-column 5, line 65, note that a determination is made whether a guidance mode has been selected or not, if yes, then the auto clear timer T1 or T2 is determined for each of the plurality of inputs entered by

the plurality of input apparatuses, and if not selected, then a auto clear timer T0 is determined for each of the plurality of inputs entered by the plurality of input apparatuses). Hence, a different automatic-clear time is determined for each of the plurality of input apparatuses, as recited in the claim.

Note that, in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., *the auto-clear times are determined differently depending on an input apparatus on which an input operation was performed*) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Furthermore, examiner does not feel that the language of claim 9 explicitly recites the limitations such as *a different automatic clear time is determined for each of the plurality of input apparatuses as compared to the input apparatus on which an input operation was performed and/or as compared to each other OR a different automatic clear time is determined for rest of the plurality of input apparatuses* as seem to be argued by the applicant.

### **Examiner Notes**

Examiner cites particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is

respectfully requested that, in preparing responses, the applicant fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 9, and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Yoshida et al., US 6,388,759 in view of Fukuda et al, JP 2002-023564.

Re claim 9, Yoshida et al. discloses an image processing apparatus (see figure 1) that receives inputs through a plurality of input apparatuses (i.e. touch panel 111, keypad 112, see figure 2) (see column 9, lines 34-45), comprising: a setter (i.e. operation input unit, OP, see figure 2) that sets an operation of the processing apparatus in accordance with an input entered through an input operation performed on an input apparatus (i.e. keypad entry) among the plurality of input apparatuses (see column 9, lines 17-58; figure 2); Yoshida further discloses setting different automatic clear times based on plurality of input conditions performed by the user via a plurality of input apparatuses (see column 13, line 44-column 14, line 48).

Yoshida fails to explicitly disclose a controller that determines an automatic-clear time for the input apparatus on which the input operation was performed, wherein a different automatic-clear time is determined for each of the plurality of input apparatuses, and if another input operation is not performed on the input apparatus during the determined automatic-clear time, executes an automatic-clear function to clear the set operation to an initially set default.

However, Fukuda et al. teaches image processing apparatus (copy machine, see paragraph 1) that receives inputs through a plurality of input apparatuses (see paragraph 11-12), and a controller (control means or auto clear time decision means) that determines an automatic-clear time for the input apparatus on which the input operation was performed (see paragraphs 5-28, note that different auto clearing times are stored in tables 1-2 according to diverse setting operating modes desired by the user corresponding to the plurality of input apparatuses), wherein a different automatic-clear time is determined for each of the plurality of input apparatuses (see paragraphs 5-28, note that different auto clearing times are stored in tables 1-2 according to diverse setting operating modes desired by the user corresponding to the plurality of input apparatuses), and if another input operation is not performed on the input apparatus during the determined automatic-clear time, executes an automatic-clear function to clear the set operation to an initially set default (see paragraphs 5-28, specifically paragraph 5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the image forming apparatus as disclosed by Yoshida to



include the increased user-friendly automatic clearing time means as taught by Fukuda et al. for the benefit of giving the user increased flexibility and convenience to set favorite automatic clear times as taught by Fukuda in abstract.

Re claim 13, Yoshida et al. fails to further disclose a table storing data of automatic-clear times respectively corresponding to the plurality of input apparatuses, wherein the controller reads data of an automatic-clear time corresponding to the input apparatus on which the input operation was performed, and determines the automatic-clear time of the read data as the automatic-clear time for the input apparatus.

However, Fukuda et al. discloses a table (see tables 1-2) storing data of automatic-clear times (see table 1-2) respectively corresponding to the plurality of input apparatuses (touch panel, key pad, see paragraphs 11-12) (see abstract; paragraphs 17-28, note that different auto clearing times are stored in tables 1-2 according to diverse setting operating modes desired by the user corresponding to the plurality of input apparatuses), wherein the controller (control means) reads data of an automatic-clear time corresponding to the input apparatus (setting operating mode chose by user relating or the input apparatus) on which the input operation was performed, and determines the automatic-clear time of the read data as the automatic-clear time for the input apparatus (see paragraphs 5, 11-28).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the image forming apparatus as disclosed by Yoshida to include the increased user-friendly automatic clearing time means as taught by Fukuda

et al. for the benefit of giving the user increased flexibility and convenience to set favorite automatic clear times as taught by Fukuda in abstract.

Re claim 14, Yoshida et al. fails to further disclose wherein the data stored in the table can be rewritten.

However, Fukuda et al. discloses wherein the data stored in the table can be rewritten (see abstract; paragraph 17-19, note that the user can chose their favorite auto clear times depending upon the needs and the present setting data containing the auto clear times is written into RAM, hence it is apparent that the user can change/set (rewrite) a suitable data into RAM according to his/her needs).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the image forming apparatus as disclosed by Yoshida to include the increased user-friendly automatic clearing time means as taught by Fukuda et al. for the benefit of giving the user increased flexibility and convenience to set favorite automatic clear times as taught by Fukuda in abstract.

3. Claims 9-12, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Yoshida et al., US 6,388,759 in view of Hirota et al., US 5,546,166.

Re claim 9, Yoshida et al. discloses an image processing apparatus (see figure 1) that receives inputs through a plurality of input apparatuses (i.e. touch panel 111, keypad 112, see figure 2) (see column 9, lines 34-45), comprising: a setter (i.e.

operation input unit, OP, see figure 2) that sets an operation of the processing apparatus in accordance with an input entered through an input operation performed on an input apparatus (i.e. keypad entry) among the plurality of input apparatuses (see column 9, lines 17-58; figure 2); Yoshida further discloses setting different automatic clear times based on plurality of input conditions performed by the user via a plurality of input apparatuses (see column 13, line 44-column 14, line 48).

Yoshida fails to explicitly disclose a controller that determines an automatic-clear time for the input apparatus on which the input operation was performed, wherein a different automatic-clear time is determined for each of the plurality of input apparatuses, and if another input operation is not performed on the input apparatus during the determined automatic-clear time, executes an automatic-clear function to clear the set operation to an initially set default.

However, Hirota teaches an image processing apparatus (see abstract) that receives inputs through a plurality of input apparatuses (see figures 1-2), and a controller (i.e. CPU) that determines an automatic-clear time for the input apparatus (see figure 1) on which the input operation was performed, wherein a different automatic-clear time is determined for each of the plurality of input apparatuses (i.e. cursor key 25, ten-key pad, etc., see figure 1) (see abstract; column 3, line 35-column 5, line 65, note that the auto clear process subroutine determines the auto clear time for inputs entered by the input apparatus. It also checks whether the guidance mode has been selected by the user or not, if yes, then the different auto clear time (auto clear timer T1 or T2) is determined (set) for each of the plurality of inputs entered by the

plurality of input apparatuses. On the other hand, if guidance mode is not selected than a different auto clear time (auto clear timer T0) is determined or each of the plurality of inputs entered by the plurality of input apparatuses), and if another input operation is not performed on the input apparatus during the determined automatic-clear time (timers T0-T2), executes an automatic-clear function to clear the set operation to an initially set default (standard conditions) (see column 1, lines 44-67; abstract; column 5, lines 20-59, note that once timers T0-T2 have finished, a warning is given to a user. And if no input key is depressed by the user during this warning timer (apparent), the process executes the auto clear function and sets the copy conditions back to standard conditions).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the image forming apparatus as disclosed by Yoshida to include the auto clear functionality as taught by Hirota et al. for the benefit of providing *“an image forming apparatus capable of alerting an operator of the timing for the operation of the auto-clear function which automatically returns the copy conditions to the standard copy conditions after completion of a copy operation, or within a predetermined time period following any key operation”* as taught by Hirota at column 2, lines 5-16.

Re claim 10, Yoshida et al. fails to further disclose a receiver that receives an extension request entered by a user to extend the determined automatic-clear time, wherein the controller extends the determined automatic-clear time after the receiver receives the extension request.

However, Hirota teaches a receiver (see figure 1) that receives an extension request (depression of guidance key 2) entered by a user to extend the determined automatic-clear time (longer auto clear time) (see column 4, line 34-column 5, line 65), wherein the controller (CPU, which controls the auto clear subroutine) extends the determined automatic-clear time (sets the longer auto clear time, timer T2) after the receiver receives the extension request (see column 4, line 34-column 5, line 65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the image forming apparatus as disclosed by Yoshida to include the auto clear functionality as taught by Hirota et al. for the benefit of providing *“an image forming apparatus capable of alerting an operator of the timing for the operation of the auto-clear function which automatically returns the copy conditions to the standard copy conditions after completion of a copy operation, or within a predetermined time period following any key operation”* as taught by Hirota at column 2, lines 5-16.

Re claim 11, Yoshida et al. discloses an identifying unit (Operational Panel, OP) that identifies the input apparatus (see figure 2) on which the input operation was performed (depression of a particular key on the key pad, fig. 2), wherein the controller (CPU) identifies (recognizes) the input apparatus (particular key selection) from a result of the identification (whether the copy mode or facsimile mode is selected) by the identifying unit (see column 9, line 17-column 12, line 58).

Re claim 12, Yoshida et al. further discloses wherein the input apparatus (see figure 2) transmits, to the identifying unit (OP), identification information that identifies the input apparatus on which the input operation was performed (see column 9, lines 17-56, note that the OP recognizes (identifies) the identification information (copy or fax mode selection) that identifies the input apparatus (the key pad, fig. 2) on which the input operation was performed (whether the copy or fax mode was selected via performing operations on the key pad), and the identifying unit (OP) identifies (recognizes) the input apparatus based on the identification information (detection information regarding selection of copy or fax mode) transmitted from the input apparatus (operations performed on the key pad, fig. 2) (see column 9, line 17-column 10, line 57).

Re claim 16, Yoshida et al. further discloses wherein the controller (CPU) determines an automatic-clear time (auto-clearing operating time) for an object input apparatus (ADF) in a manner where the longer an interval between input operations in the object input apparatus is expected to be (manual placement of the originals in ADF), the longer the automatic-clear time determined for the object input apparatus is (T2 is longer than the T1) (see column 13, line 60-column 14, line 48).

(Note that Hirota also discloses the controller (CPU) determines an automatic-clear time for an object input apparatus in a manner where the longer an interval between input operations in the object input apparatus is expected to be (if the user needs longer time to read and understand the methods for setting the copy functions in between input operations, see column 1, lines 30-67), the longer the automatic-clear

time determined for the object input apparatus is (Timer T2) (column 3, line 35-column 5, line 65, note that Timer T2 is assigned, which is longer than normal auto clear time is assigned by the controller upon the request of the user).

4. Claims 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Yoshida et al., US 6,388,759 in view of Hirota et al., US 5,546,166 further in view of well-known art.

Re claim 17, Yoshida et al. fails to further disclose wherein at least one of the plurality of input apparatuses is connected to the image processing apparatus via a network.

However, Official Notice is taken to note that ability to have least one of the plurality of input apparatuses (i.e. keyboard) is connected to the image processing apparatus (i.e. copying machine) via a PC on the network is notoriously well known and commonly used in the art. It would have been obvious to have a keyboard connected to a PC, which is connected to the image processing apparatus of Yoshida for the benefit of enabling the user to provide further interactive input, and for increased user flexibility and options.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the image forming apparatus as disclosed by Yoshida to include the auto clear functionality as taught by Hirota et al. for the benefit of providing *“an image forming apparatus capable of alerting an operator of the timing for the operation of the auto-clear function which automatically returns the copy conditions to*

Art Unit: 2625

*the standard copy conditions after completion of a copy operation, or within a predetermined time period following any key operation”* as taught by Hirota at column 2, lines 5-16.

Re claim 18, Yoshida et al. fails to further disclose at least one of the plurality of input apparatuses is connected to a terminal apparatus that is connected to the image processing apparatus via a network.

However, Official Notice is taken to note that ability to have least one of the plurality of input apparatuses (i.e. keyboard) is connected to a terminal apparatus (i.e. PC) that is connected to the image processing apparatus (i.e. copying machine) via a network is notoriously well known and commonly used in the art. It would have been obvious to have a keyboard connected to a PC, which is connected to the image processing apparatus of Yoshida for the benefit of enabling the user to provide further interactive input, and for increased user flexibility and options.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the image forming apparatus as disclosed by Yoshida to include the auto clear functionality as taught by Hirota et al. for the benefit of providing *“an image forming apparatus capable of alerting an operator of the timing for the operation of the auto-clear function which automatically returns the copy conditions to the standard copy conditions after completion of a copy operation, or within a predetermined time period following any key operation”* as taught by Hirota at column 2, lines 5-16.



Re claim 19, Yoshida et al. fails to further disclose after executing the automatic-clear function, the controller notifies the terminal apparatus of a fact that the controller has executed the automatic-clear function.

However, Official Notice is taken to note that ability to have the image processing apparatus (copying machine or printer) notifying the PC with an updated status corresponding to an operation performed by it that whether the printing has finished successfully or if an error has occurred (i.e. paper jam, out of paper) is notoriously well known and commonly used in the art. It would have been obvious to have image processing apparatus of Yoshida to notify the PC of its current status after performing an operation like auto-clear for the benefit of providing the user with increased flexibility, options, convenience, and efficient status updating system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the image forming apparatus as disclosed by Yoshida to include the auto clear functionality as taught by Hirota et al. for the benefit of providing *“an image forming apparatus capable of alerting an operator of the timing for the operation of the auto-clear function which automatically returns the copy conditions to the standard copy conditions after completion of a copy operation, or within a predetermined time period following any key operation”* as taught by Hirota at column 2, lines 5-16.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claim 15 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art of record (Hirota) teaches allocating a longer auto clear time for complex operations (non universal design compliant) associated with the input apparatuses but does not disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed inventions of (in combination with all other limitations in the claims), the controller determines a longer automatic-clear time for an input apparatus that is universal-design-compliant than for an input apparatus that is not universal-design-compliant as set forth in claim 15.

***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

***Contact Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PAWANDEEP S. DHINGRA whose telephone number is (571)270-1231. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:30-7:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Twyler L. Haskins can be reached on 571-272-7406. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/P. D./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/Twyler L. Haskins/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625